



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,949	05/02/2006	Etienne Annic	0600-1197	4822
466 7590 YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 Alexandria, VA 22314			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T	
			ART UNIT 2438	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/09/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,949

Applicant(s)

ANNIC ET AL.

Examiner

MINH DIEU NGUYEN

Art Unit

2438

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/21/2006
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the communication dated March 21, 2006.
2. Claims 14-26 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 3/21/2006 has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because
"simplified signature module" is element 66, not 60 as disclosed.
Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

5. Claims 14, 26 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a) As to claim 14, the phrase "all the data flows pass" should be --all data flows pass--; "the response to be provided by the same user" should be --response to be provided by same user--; "the identity of the user" should be --identity of the user--.
 - b) As to claim 26, for claim consistency, it is suggested claim 26 should recite as follows: System according to any one of the preceding claims, characterized in that the supplementary server comprises the simplified signature module (66)...

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 14-15, 20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray (2002/0188738) in view of Oku (7,320,024) and further in view of Howard et al. (2003/0204610).

a) As to claim 14, Gray discloses a system for access to a packet switching network suitable for implementing a simplified signature method, this system comprising:

- a proxy server through which all the data flows pass which are exchanged between a user and the network (i.e. home gateway connecting end-users to the network, Gray: Fig. 10, element 205).

- a plurality of service providers which are connected to the network, each service provider being capable of transmitting an authentication request to the user who contacts it in order to identify and/or authenticate this user before providing him with personalized and/or secure services, the response to be provided by the same user to this authentication request being able to be different in accordance with the service provider contacted (i.e. plurality of network access servers sends challenge message to the end user for obtaining user's identifier and password, Gray: 0003, 0036, 0039).

- at least one authentication server which is capable of storing at least one item of authentication data for each user and transmitting, in response to an authentication request, an authentication response which contains an item of authentication data in accordance with both the service provider who transmitted the authentication request and the identity of the user who contacted this service provider (i.e. one of authentication servers, Gray: Fig. 4, elements A-C, performs authentication and sends a response message to the server 24, Gray: 0047), and

- a simplified signature module which is capable of automatically processing on behalf of the user the authentication requests transmitted by the service providers contacted, this module being capable for each user:

- of directing the authentication requests to the appropriate authentication server and

- of transmitting to the service provider the corresponding authentication response transmitted by the appropriate authentication server, characterized in that it comprises a supplementary server which is independent from the proxy server, the simplified signature module being implemented in this supplementary server, and in that the proxy server is provided with an interface which allows it to be connected to the supplementary server and allows at least the authentication requests transmitted by the service providers contacted to be transmitted to the supplementary server in order to process these requests using the simplified signature module (i.e. proxy server 211 receives access request, selects one of the authentication servers 212, 213, forwards the access request to the selected authentication server. The selected authentication server 212 or 213 processes the access request and sends a response to the proxy server 211, Gray: 0104, 0046; the home gateway is connected to proxy server via network 210, Gray: Fig. 10).

Gray is silent on the capability of storing at least one item of authentication data for each user and having an authentication response which contains an item of authentication data in accordance with both the service provider who transmitted the authentication request and the identity of the user who contacted this service provider.

Oku is relied on for the teaching of storing at least one item of authentication data for each user and having an authentication response which contains an item of authentication data in accordance with both the service provider who transmitted the authentication request and the identity of the user who contacted this service provider

(i.e. approving the use with the site ID of the web server and user information, Oku: Fig. 3, step 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of storing at least one item of authentication data for each user and having an authentication response which contains an item of authentication data in accordance with both the service provider who transmitted the authentication request and the identity of the user who contacted this service provider in the system of Gray, as Oku discloses so as to securely and efficiently providing contents to users on a network.

The combination of Gray and Oku is silent on the capability of having the response to be provided by the same user to this authentication request being able to be different in accordance with the service provider contacted.

Howard is relied on for the teaching of having the response to be provided by the same user to this authentication request being able to be different in accordance with the service provider contacted (i.e. different log-ins for different servers, Howard: 0046).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having the response to be provided by the same user to this authentication request being able to be different in accordance with the service provider contacted in the system of Gray and Oku, as Howard teaches so as to strengthen security of the network.

b) As to claim 15, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard disclosed characterized in that the simplified signature module comprises a sub-module which is

capable of identifying the user from his network address and adding an identifier of the user to the authentication requests directed to the authentication servers (Oku: col. 6, lines 42-48).

c) As to claim 20, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard disclosed characterized in that the supplementary server and the proxy server are capable of communicating with each other using a Hyper Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) (Oku: col. 5, lines 33-42).

d) As to claim 22, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard disclosed characterized in that the supplementary server (60) is capable of communicating with the service providers only by means of the Hyper Text Transfer Protocol used between it and the proxy server (Oku: col. 2, lines 44-62).

e) As to claim 23, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard disclosed characterized in that the supplementary server also implements an HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol) server and/or client in order to communicate directly with the or each service provider and/or the or each authentication server using only the HTTP protocol (Oku: col. 2, lines 44-62)..

f) As to claim 24, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard disclosed characterized in that it comprises a provider of access to the network to which the user must be connected in order to be able to access the network, this access provider being provided with the proxy server (Oku: Fig. 1, element 10)

g) As to claim 25, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard disclosed characterized in that the network is the World Wide Web (Oku: Fig. 1, element 20).

h) As to claim 26, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard disclosed, characterized in that it comprises the simplified signature module which is capable of automatically processing on behalf of the user the authentication requests transmitted by the or each service provider contacted, and is capable of communicating with a proxy server in order to receive at least the authentication requests transmitted by the service providers (Gray: Fig. 10).

8. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray (2002/0188738) in view of Oku (7,320,024) in view of Howard et al. (2003/0204610) and further in view of Brickell et al. (2003/0115142).

a) As to claim 16, the combination of Gray, Oku and Howard is silent on the capability of having characterized in that the at least one item of authentication data stored for each user comprises an item of data relating to a level of authentication available for this user, in that each authentication request transmitted by a service provider specifies features relating to the authentication level required by this service provider in order to be able to access the services it provides, in that the or each authentication server is capable of comparing the features relating to the required authentication level specified by the authentication request with the data relating to the authentication level available in order to determine whether the authentication level required corresponds to the authentication level available for this user, and in that the or each authentication server is capable of transmitting to the user an active authentication request which is capable of activating an interactive process for identification and/or

authentication of the user if the authentication level required does not correspond to the authentication level available.

Brickell is relied on for the teaching of having characterized in that the at least one item of authentication data stored for each user comprises an item of data relating to a level of authentication available for this user, in that each authentication request transmitted by a service provider specifies features relating to the authentication level required by this service provider in order to be able to access the services it provides, in that the or each authentication server is capable of comparing the features relating to the required authentication level specified by the authentication request with the data relating to the authentication level available in order to determine whether the authentication level required corresponds to the authentication level available for this user, and in that the or each authentication server is capable of transmitting to the user an active authentication request which is capable of activating an interactive process for identification and/or authentication of the user if the authentication level required does not correspond to the authentication level available (Brickell: 0044, 0047-0049).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having characterized in that the at least one item of authentication data stored for each user comprises an item of data relating to a level of authentication available for this user, in that each authentication request transmitted by a service provider specifies features relating to the authentication level required by this service provider in order to be able to access the services it provides, in that the or each authentication server is capable of comparing the features relating to the required

authentication level specified by the authentication request with the data relating to the authentication level available in order to determine whether the authentication level required corresponds to the authentication level available for this user, and in that the or each authentication server is capable of transmitting to the user an active authentication request which is capable of activating an interactive process for identification and/or authentication of the user if the authentication level required does not correspond to the authentication level available in the system of Gray, Oku and Howard, as Brickell teaches, so as to provide a reliable and flexible way to authentication users across complex distributed networks (Bricknell: 0003).

b) As to claims 17-18, the combination of Gray, Oku, Howard and Bricknell discloses characterized in that the supplementary server comprises a sub-module which is capable of directing the response of the user to the active authentication requests to the authentication server which has transmitted it and characterized in that the supplementary server comprises a sub-module which is capable of directing the active authentication request to the user (Oku: Fig. 3, steps 4, 7, 13; Bricknell: 0044, 0047-0049).

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray (2002/0188738) in view of Oku (7,320,024) in view of Howard et al. (2003/0204610) and further in view of Kondo (7,406,712).

The combination of Gray, Oku and Howard is silent on the capability of having characterized in that the simplified signature module comprises a sub-module which is

capable of adding, to the requests transmitted by the user to a service provider, an identification signal of a simplified signature service, in response to which the service provider transmits the authentication request.

Kondo is relied on for the teaching of having characterized in that the simplified signature module comprises a sub-module which is capable of adding, to the requests transmitted by the user to a service provider, an identification signal of a simplified signature service, in response to which the service provider transmits the authentication request (Kondo: col. 8, lines 38-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having characterized in that the simplified signature module comprises a sub-module which is capable of adding, to the requests transmitted by the user to a service provider, an identification signal of a simplified signature service, in response to which the service provider transmits the authentication request in the system of Gray, Oku and Howard, as Kondo teaches, so as to identify the server providing service in the request.

10. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray (2002/0188738) in view of Oku (7,320,024) in view of Howard et al. (2003/0204610) and further in view of Takeshima (7,219,134).

The combination of Gray, Oku and Howard discloses HTTP, however it is silent on the capability of having characterized in that the Hyper Text Transfer Protocol is the iCAP protocol (Internet Content Adaptation Protocol) or the OCP protocol (OPES Call

Out Protocol).

Takeshima is relied on for the teaching of having characterized in that the Hyper Text Transfer Protocol is the iCAP protocol (Internet Content Adaptation Protocol) or the OCP protocol (OPES Call Out Protocol) (Takeshima: col. 6, lines 48-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of characterized in that the Hyper Text Transfer Protocol is the iCAP protocol (Internet Content Adaptation Protocol) or the OCP protocol (OPES Call Out Protocol) in the system of Gray, Oku and Howard, as Takeshima teaches, so as to utilize the existing open standard protocol for content adaptation.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Taghi T. Arani can be reached on 571-272-3787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2438

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Minh Dieu Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2438